

This material contains information affecting the National Defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Laws, Title 18, U.S.C. Secs. 793 and 794, the transmission or revelation of which in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

25X1

REPORT

DATE DISTR. 26 April 1955

NO. OF PAGES 6

DATE OF INFO.

REQUIREMENT

25X1

PLACE ACQUIRED

REFERENCES

25X1

This is UNEVALUATED Information

THE SOURCE EVALUATIONS IN THIS REPORT ARE DEFINITIVE.
THE APPRAISAL OF CONTENT IS TENTATIVE.
(FOR KEY SEE REVERSE)

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

25 YEAR RE-REVIEW

STATE	#X	ARMY	#X	NAVY	#X	AIR	#X	FBI		AEC		SECRET	X
-------	----	------	----	------	----	-----	----	-----	--	-----	--	--------	---

(NOTE: Washington distribution indicated by "X"; Field distribution by "#".)

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

REPORT

25X1

COUNTRY Czechoslovakia

DATE DISTR. 22 Mar. 1955

SUBJECT Program for Evaluation of Natural and
Economic Conditions in Agriculture

NO. OF PAGES 5

DATE OF INFORMATION

REFERENCES:

PLACE ACQUIRED

25X1

THIS IS UNEVALUATED INFORMATION

Purpose, Progress, and Areas Concerned

25X1

1. Agroprojekt, ERS (Ekonomickorozvojove stredisko - economic development center), was engaged in a program for evaluation of natural and economic conditions in agriculture for the entire Gottwaldov, Liberec, and Presov Regions, as well as for the Mistek (N 49-09, E 18-00) District, Ostrava Region, for the Broumov (N 50-35, E 16-20) District and two districts adjacent to it in the Hradec Kralove Region, and for the Podborany (N 50-14, E 13-25) District, Zlutice (N 50-06, E 13-11) District, and one other district in the Karlovy Vary Region. The purpose of the program was to determine conditions for agricultural mass production in these areas; the results were to serve as a basis for various planning programs, for determining optimum production capacity, and for building up socialistic agricultural mass production. The entire project and its resulting data were classified "secret" and Agroprojekt employees were not allowed to reveal any essential facts to the local inhabitants. the program was based on agreements between respective regional national committees and the former Geoplan firm which later became Geometra, National Enterprise. It was finally reorganized, in April 1954, into Agroprojekt, ERS, State Institute.

25X1

25X1

25X1

2. The Liberec Region was the first area in which this program was completed. Work was started in 1951 and completed in 1953. The program was initiated in the Gottwaldov Region in the fall of 1951 and it was planned to have work completed there by May 1955. A total of 26 employees of Agroprojekt, ERS, Brno Center, all of whom were graduate engineers in agriculture, worked in the Gottwaldov Region until 1 August 1954 when their number was reduced to about 13. The other engineers were transferred to work on the proposed investment plan for state farms. At the time the number of engineers was reduced, work had been completed in the Hodnin (N 48-52, E 17-08) and Kyjov (N 49-01, E 17-07) Districts and

CONFIDENTIAL

25 YEAR RE-REVIEW

CONFIDENTIAL

- 2 -

25X1

work was near completion in the Uherske Hradiste (N 49-04, E 17-27) District. Approximately 80% of the work had been completed in the remaining districts of the region, except in the Vsetin (N 49-20, E 18-00) and Valasske Klobouky (N 49-09, E 18-00) Districts where about 50% of the work was still to be done.

25X1

Maps Used

3. Maps, scale 1:25,000, were used for work in the Liberec, Presov, and Karlovy Vary Regions; maps, scale 1:5,000, were used for the Gottwaldov Region, for the Mistek District, and for the three districts in the Hradec Kralove Region. The regional national committee decided which scale would be used. Obviously, the work required more time, was necessarily much more thorough, and the results were more detailed when using the scale 1:5,000. As a matter of fact, in June 1954, executives from the main Agroprojekt, ERS, office in Prague stated that in the near future, when beginning work in new areas, only maps, scale 1:25,000, would be used. When maps, scale 1:5,000, were used the work required too much time and money. Furthermore, the results were rough plans in either case and required supplementary details before final decisions could be made.
4. The maps, scale 1:5,000, were taken from cadastral maps. Some of the cadastral maps set forth the areas as they existed prior to World War II; others had been amended during the war.

25X1

The cadastral maps were redrawn on ozalid paper, omitting all unnecessary details. The resulting copy was photographically decreased to scale 1:5,000 and reproduced again. The entire process was handled by the Regional Map Archives which were subordinate to the regional national committees. The archives for the Gottwaldov Region were located in Uherske Hradiste. Agroprojekt purchased five copies of each map from the archives.

Program Outline

5. The complete program consisted of the following:
 - a. A basic survey of the terrain.
 - b. Notation and appraisal of the results of the basic survey.
 - c. An economic survey of the area.
 - d. Suggested plans for organization of socialistic agricultural mass production.

Basic Survey


6. The purpose of the basic survey was to acquire knowledge regarding the terrain. Each employee was assigned an area which he had to cover together with a copy of all maps of that area. These copies were called "working maps". In areas where the necessary pedological survey had not yet been performed, either within the HTUP (Agricultural Land Adjustment Program - Hospodarsko-technicka uprava pudy) or some other program, the engineers were to make the pedological survey first. The soil was tested at a depth of 1.5 meters and one test was made for each 10 hectares. In areas where the pedological survey had already been completed, the resulting data were

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3 -

used for this program. Important features of the terrain which were not shown on the cadastral maps, because they occurred after these maps had been amended, were appropriately noted on the maps by the engineers. These included newly forested or deforested areas, areas on which new buildings had been erected or new roads had been built, etc. These areas were merely sketched on the map; no measurements were taken.

7. Areas shown as agricultural areas on the map but which no longer served agricultural purposes were outlined in black and filled in with red. Areas which were not being used for agricultural purposes at the time of the survey but which still had agricultural value, e.g., military training fields, areas designated for mine fields, etc., were left white on the map. Quarries were indicated by white areas with the following figure: . Agricultural land was indicated according to the five following categories:

- a. Permanent meadows located in valleys.
- b. Valley areas which were most suitable for use as meadows but which could be plowed.
- c. Fields.
- d. Pasture land.
- e. Infertile land. This land was proposed for forestation or simply noted as infertile on the map.

Agricultural land which was endangered by erosion, because of both water and wind, as well as land located on faults, was noted on the map. Finally, the entire area was studied to determine the degree of possible mechanization of agriculture. In this regard, accessibility of the terrain, inclination of the slopes, distance from communications, etc., were considered.

Notation and Appraisal of Basic Survey Results

8. After the basic survey of an area was completed, the results shown on the working map were appraised and, depending on their character, were noted on one of three different maps -- identical copies of the original, scale 1:5,000:

- a. Soil map on which the composition of the agricultural land was indicated. The soil was classified shallow when not more than 30 cm. deep, medium when from 30 to 80 cm. deep, and deep when more than 80 cm. in depth. The soil was always measured from its surface down to the level of rocky decay. Another classification, called "mechanics" of the soil, indicated whether the soil was light, sandy, medium or loam, heavy or clay.

- b. Mechanization map on which the inclination of the terrain was indicated according to the following five categories:

- (1) Plains. Slopes inclined from zero to three degrees on which mechanized agriculture could be practiced to the fullest extent, including use of heavy machinery such as combines.
- (2) Moderately rolling country. Slopes inclined from three to five degrees with limited utilization of heavy agricultural machinery.
- (3) Moderately hilly country. Slopes inclined from five to 10 degrees on which only light tractors could be used.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- 4 -

25X1

- (4) Hilly terrain. Slopes inclined from 10 to 15 degrees on which no tractors could be used. Horses and oxen were used.
- (5) Mountainous terrain. Slopes inclined more than 15 degrees on which no mechanization was possible.

The areas endangered by erosion were also noted on the map for mechanization. No detailed or definite plans were made for counteracting the erosion; however, general suggestions were made which called for changes in crop rotation in the affected areas. It was suggested that fodder crops be planted along the contour lines at right angles to the incline of the slope. Since fodder crops absorb more water than most other plants, this would create an area which would prevent water from rushing down the slopes. Should this suggestion be enforced, the amount of fodder crops grown in the Gottwaldov Region would be considerably increased. Fodder crops would then cover 10% more arable land than at present. this plan suggested for soil erosion control was one of the few good points of the entire program since, should the suggested plan be employed at some time in the future, it would necessarily have to be applied throughout an entire area, regardless of the political regime and regardless of the organization of agriculture at the time.

25X1

- c. Delimitation maps. On the basis of established natural agricultural conditions, especially the quality of the soil and the possibility for mechanization, the best use of the agricultural land was determined. The agricultural land was divided into optimum areas for forestation, pastures, permanent meadows, temporary meadows, and arable land. These optimum areas were sketched on the delimitation map. The appraisal of the agricultural land and its division into optimum areas were considered strictly from the point of view of agricultural mass production and aimed to create large complexes of land falling into definite categories. The crops which were actually being cultivated in the areas at the time of the survey were not taken into consideration. Thus, small isolated fields in forests or plots of arable land surrounded by meadows, most of which were owned by private farmers, were merged with the surrounding territory because they would prove unprofitable for mass production.

Economic Survey of the Area

9. Along with the survey of natural agricultural conditions, the results of which were entered on the maps as stated above, a survey and appraisal of economic conditions for the entire area was prepared. This survey consisted of collecting as much data as possible, all pertaining to current agricultural production. Some of the data included were: number of people working in agriculture; town and village population; number of hectares per agricultural laborer; number of liters of milk per cow; efficiency of tractor and machinery pools, which was determined by dividing total tractor horsepower into 15 horsepower tractor units and then determining the number of hectares per tractor; and number of individual types of livestock per hectare of agricultural land and arable land. The economic survey was used by regional national committees for various planning operations and also served as a basis for suggested plans in solidifying the organization of socialistic agricultural mass production.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- 5 -

25X1

Suggested Plans for Organization of Socialistic Mass Production

10. These initial plans were part of the entire program and were also the responsibility of Agroprojekt employees. The planned organization called for setting up Centers for Agricultural Production. Each center was responsible for an area of several villages and thus the outline of the area conformed to the outer territorial outline of the villages given on the cadastral maps. Each center was to administer from 2,000 to 5,000 hectares. The agricultural work within the area administered by each center was to be handled by several branch units administered by the center. The areas of individual branch units were not to conform to village cadastral territory; but, instead, the entire center area was to be divided among the several branch units on the basis of purely practical reasons. As a matter of fact, villages already existing were not necessarily to serve as branch units. The establishment of entirely new branch units was considered. All this planning was done without regard to present ownership of land, be it a private farm or a cooperative. Actually, both the existing private farms and the cooperatives would be abolished and new cooperatives would be set up instead. Obviously, this suggested organization followed the present organizational setup of state farms, except that it applied to cooperatives. These plans were in the form of suggestions only; no details were discussed. These initial plans, in due time, were to serve as a basis for detailed planning in building up socialistic agricultural mass production.

Conclusion

11. All resulting data of the entire program were turned over to the Planning Departments of the regional national committees.
12. The program for evaluation of natural and economic conditions in agriculture, as well as all the procedures and methods used in carrying out the program, were initiated at the time when an open attempt was made to change the existing types of agriculture to socialistic agricultural mass production. As of late summer 1954, the program had not been changed at all in spite of the "new course" in agriculture which was officially proclaimed at the end of 1953. The fact that the "new course" did not affect this program might serve as proof that the Communists had not necessarily changed their plans for establishing socialistic agricultural mass production in the near future. However, it also might only serve to illustrate the degree of confusion among Communist officials, especially among those on regional national committees. Since these officials did not really know what to do about the supposed change in Communist policy, they may have preferred to continue the program as originally planned. Dr. Ing. Svoboda (fnu), the manager of the Agroprojekt department at the Ministry of Agriculture, when discussing this program with Agroprojekt officials in April 1954, said: "We are about to complete the program for Gottwaldov, but this region is scheduled to be the last of all regions to be built up for socialistic agricultural mass production." [redacted] it was because the agricultural terrain there was not suitable for socialistic agricultural mass production and that resistance among local inhabitants was believed to be rather strong.

25X1

25X1

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL